Brown & Root *Services*

55 Jonspin Road / Wilmington, MA 01887-1020 / 978-658-7899 / Fax: 978-658-7870

C-NAVY-12-97-1097W

December 10, 1997

Project Number 5278

Mr. James X. Shafer
Remedial Project Manager
Northern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
10 Industrial Highway, Mail Stop 82
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298
Contract Task Order 218

Subject: RAB Meeting Minutes

Dear Mr. Shafer:

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes from the November 19, 1997 RAB meeting.

If you have any questions about this matter, please contact me at 978-658-7899.

Very truly yours,

Betsy Horne

Betsy Horne
Community Relations Specialist

BH:ib

Enclosure

c: Dr. D. K. Abbass (w/enc.)
Mr. Alfred Arruda, Jr. (w/enc.)
Ms. Mary A. Blake (w/enc.)
Dr. David W. Brown (w/enc.)
Mr. Paul M. Cormier (w/enc.)
Mr. Anthony D'Agnenica (w/enc.)
Ms. Beth Everett (w/enc.)
Mr. Mike Foley (w/enc.)

Mr. Byron J. Hall (w/enc.)
Ms. Elizabeth Mathinos (w/enc.)
Mr. Joseph McEnness (w/enc.)
Mr. Thomas McGrath (w/enc.)
Mr. T. R. McGrath, Jr. (w/enc.)
Mr. Howard L. Porter (w/enc.)
Mr. Paul D. Russell (w/enc.)
Mr. Charles Salmond (w/enc.)
Mr. John Torgan (w/enc.)
Ms. Claudette Weissinger (w/enc.)
Ms. Mary Philcox (w/enc.)
Mr. David Egan (w/enc.)
Mr. Tom Nicholson (w/enc.)
Mr. Paul Kulpa, DEM (w/enc.)
Ms. Kymberlee Keckler, EPA (w/enc.)
Capt. Jon Wyman, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Bob Jones, Groton (w/enc.)
Mr. David Sanders, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Brad Wheeler, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Peter Palmerino, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Kevin Coyle, NETC (w/enc.)
Ms. Melissa Griffin, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Woody Monaco, NETC (w/enc.)
Ms. Sarah White, EPA (w/enc.)
Ms. Jennifer Hayes, Gannett Fleming (w/enc.)
Mr. Tim Prior, USF&WS (w/enc.)
Mr. Ken Finkelstein, NOAA (w/enc.)
Capt. Bogle, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. James Barden (w/enc.)
Hon. Paul W. Crowley (w/enc.)
Hon. June Gibbs (w/enc.)
Councilman Dennis McCoy (w/enc.)
Mr. Vincent Arnold (w/enc.)
Dr. David Kim (w/enc.)
Mr. Brian Bishop (w/enc.)
Sister Annie Marie Walsh (w/enc.)
Brother Joseph (w/enc.)
Newport Public Library (w/enc.)
Ms. Joanne Gorman, Middletown Free Library (w/enc.)
Portsmouth Free Public Library (w/enc.)
Mr. R. Boucher, NORTHDIV (w/o enc.)
Ms. Diane McKenna, B&RE, Wilmington (w/enc.)
Mr. Garth Glenn, B&RE, Philadelphia (w/enc.)
Ms. Meg Price, B&RE, Philadelphia (w/o enc.)
File 5278-3.2 w/o enc./9.4 w/enc.

NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
NOVEMBER 19, 1997

MINUTES

On Wednesday, November 19, 1997, the NETC Newport Installation Restoration Program Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) gathered at the NETC Officers' Club for its monthly meeting. The meeting began at 7:05 pm and ended at 9:11 pm.

Thirteen of the 18 RAB community members attended: Kathy Abbass, Al Arruda, David Brown, Paul Cormier, Beth Everett, Byron Hall, Liz Mathinos, Tom McGrath, T. R. McGrath, Howard Porter, Paul Russell, Chuck Salmond, and Claudette Weissinger. Other RAB members attending were: Paul Kulpa, the RIDEM Remedial Project Manager, and Kymberlee Keckler, EPA Remedial Project Manager. Brad Wheeler, the NETC IR Program Manager, and David Sanders, PAO, were present. Mary Philcox from the Aquidneck Island Citizens Advisory Board (AICAB) was also present, with the TAG technical advisor, David Egan, and his colleague, Tom Nicholson. Sarah White, EPA's Community Involvement Coordinator, and Todd Bober, NORTHDIV's NETC technical manager attended. Mary Blake, Tony D'Agnenica, Joe McEnness, and John Torgan provided notice of their absence. Mike Foley was not present.

Agenda items are denoted in the minutes by the underscored headings.

CALL TO ORDER

Captain Wyman, the Navy Co-Chair, called the meeting to order and asked those who were present for the first time to introduce themselves. Those responding included Art Holcolmb, Foster Wheeler, NETC's Remedial Action contractor; Jennifer Stump, EPA's NETC oversight contractor from Gannett Fleming; Chris Tompsett from NUWC; and Dunnie Wingo, from NORTHDIV. The minutes were adopted following a change recommended by David Brown. He requested that the previous month's minutes indicate that the draft October minutes include a copy of the comprehensive site evaluation matrix filled in with information discussed that evening. It was agreed that a revised page will be disseminated to the RAB with the draft minutes from tonight's meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Membership Committee - Paul Russell indicated no change had occurred since his last report. The RAB is still looking for new members; he has applications if anyone wishes to obtain one.

Public Information Committee - Claudette Weissinger met with her committee before this meeting; they began compiling a list of environmental and other groups on which the RAB can focus outreach efforts. She also indicated that the RAB would be interested in seeing Captain

Wyman's recent presentation to the League of Women Voters. Tomorrow evening Captain Wyman is speaking to the Aquidneck Island Planning Committee.

Comment: Did you uncover any surprising questions or issues with that audience?
Response: Yes, one from one woman: she had assumed that any site included in the IR program must be contaminated to a level equal to Love Canal. She was startled to see how benign most of the sites appeared.

Planning Committee - Jim Shafer discussed several sites. They are: finalizing work plans for the NUSC Disposal Area, Gould Island Electroplating Shop, and continued work at Melville North Landfill; contracting with Brown & Root to conduct a Site Investigation at Tank Farm Four (a draft work plan is due April 30, 1998); initiating a remedial investigation report for OFFTA; and negotiating with the state on conducting a No Further Action record of decision at Tank Farm Five (a decision is expected next month).

Project Committee - Kathy Abbass stated the committee met at 6 pm with Charlotte Taylor from the Rhode Island Historical Preservation Commission, who discussed that organization's role involving IR site activities. Ken Finkelstein, from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), will be the 6 pm speaker at the next RAB meeting.

Jim summarized the status of site work. Half the tanks at Tank Farm Four have been imploded. The last of the work should be completed just after the first of the new year. The Derecktor Shipyard berm has been removed (soil is staged on site pending results of an analytical evaluation). A work plan is due in December for the remainder of the on-shore removal action. All buildings at the site have been demolished except for Building 42.

NEW BUSINESS

Captain Wyman announced that Brad Wheeler has accepted a position as the base energy engineer. The RAB expressed its thanks to Brad for his enthusiastic support of RAB activities and wished him well. Captain Wyman introduced Peter Palmerino; he and Woody Monaco will be working with the RAB. Kevin Coyle will be taking on many of Brad's day-to-day IR responsibilities until the position can be filled officially. Captain Wyman thought that hiring a replacement would take at least 3 months.

PRESENTATIONS

Three presentations were on the agenda.

IR Site Work Plans

Steve Parker from Brown & Root discussed the NUSC Disposal Area (Site 8) SASE work plan. An SASE is being conducted because, although the site was used as a fill area between 1951 and 1988, anecdotal evidence does not exist indicating that anything beyond inert materials

(empty paint cans, scrap lumber, wire, cables, tires, etc.) are present. No sampling has been conducted. Steve used a s ries of overhead graphics to illustrate his presentation.

The project is divided into three phases: Phase I includes a site walkover, a records search, and soil gas sample collection and analysis. Phase II involves digging test pits, collecting and analyzing surface and subsurface soil samples, and determining the specific boundaries of the fill areas. Phase III includes installing wells, and collecting and analyzing groundwater; collecting and analyzing surface water and sediment from the two streams on site; surveying the area; and evaluating the ecological setting.

The results of these field investigations will result in an SASE report. The report will identify the types and amounts of chemicals found, describe the site's geology and how water travels through the area, describe the fill boundaries, and include abbreviated human health and ecological risk assessments to determine if further investigations or remediation are required.

Comment: What features exist on the site?
Response: Two small brooks run through the site and collect in a pond. The site is also the upper drainage area for West Main Road.

Comment: In the Initial Assessment Study, both NUSC and Coddington Cove Rubble Fill were determined to need no further action. What has changed to prompt the Navy to revisit that judgment?
Response: New data has been found since the 1993 IAS, which was based on a site walkover. The same is true for OFFTA.

Comment: What are the chances that the SASE will determine that no further study is necessary?
Response: It is difficult to tell. Jim reminded that RAB that when the SASE report is finished, the Navy will confer with EPA and the state; they need to concur on the Navy's recommendation. Paul Kulpa encouraged RAB members to speak up now if they have any information that would support the SASE study.

Comment: How big is the site?
Response: It comprises approximately 1 acre.

Comment: How is a soil gas survey conducted?
Response: A small capsule of absorbent material is placed in a hole for from 3 to 6 weeks. Since vapors in the soil adsorb to the material, it can be analyzed to estimate the extent of VOC contamination in the soil.

Paul Cormier, who was a NUWC employee, mentioned that tanks containing hydrogen peroxide were located on the hilly portion of the site; the pond was built as a dilution pond below them to capture the material in case of an accident. He also recalled above ground pipes into which NUSC chemists were instructed to dump alkaline and acidic wastes (in later years these materials were hauled away). Kymberlee Keckler requested that this area be sampled during the SASE field work. Paul agreed to participate in a site walk; the state requested that it be invited to attend as well. Paul also remembered that automobile fuels

were stored in four storage areas with berms around them. He also knows of a few other retirees and agreed to attempt to contact them. He mentioned that he participated on a toxic materials committee in the 1960s and 1970s. Meeting minutes may still exist; Steve said they would look for them as part of the records search.

Steve also summarized the Gould Island Electroplating Shop (Site 17) RI work plan. He used a series of overhead graphics to illustrate his presentation. The work plan focuses on the shop but the work plan scope may be expanded because the Navy is still trying to determine what other areas may be involved. The shop was used during World War II to recondition torpedoes. Those operations resulted in discharges, through pipes, to Narragansett Bay. The Corps of Engineers collected samples that indicated the presence of copper and cyanide in sediments and mussels near the outfall pipes. Plating wastes in the shop were removed by the Navy in 1992.

The RI field work will be conducted in two phases. Phase I involves removing equipment from the shop so that concrete floor samples can be collected and analyzed, and drain trenches can be tracked to outfalls. Samples will be collected from drainlines and wash water; sediment will be collected from expected outfall areas. Surface soil samples will be collected from outside and under the building. Phase II includes drilling borings and sampling subsurface soil; installing wells and sampling groundwater; and evaluating the ecological setting. The RI report will discuss the chemicals and concentrations found, report the locations of the drainage pipe discharges, describe the local geology, and include both a human health and an ecological risk assessment.

Jim mentioned that the draft final work plan did not reflect comments from the state or EPA since it was submitted last week. Jim also reminded the RAB that he is working with the Corps of Engineers to determine if they would conduct the Electroplating Shop investigation as they work on their own 14 Gould Island sites. The Corps is planning on initiating their field work next summer. If funds become available, the Navy will try to initiate a cost-effective investigation, coordinated with the Corps. Currently, funding for the Electroplating Shop field work will not become available until fiscal year 2000.

Comment: What is the location of the pipe where the Corps sampled?
Response: The pipe's actual discharge location is not known and discharge pipes have deteriorated significantly even over the past 2 years. Todd indicated that mussel and sediment samples may not have been associated with the exact pipe discharges. Paul Kulpa stated that the Confirmation Study was conducted in 1986; the Corps samples were taken a year or so later. Steve also mentioned that this proposed sample collection effort would help determine whether contaminants are still present.

Captain Wyman said he would request that a representative of the Corps attend the January RAB meeting. Tony Riccio is Jim's contact.

Comment: A history of the torpedo station is located in the Naval War College archives; this information may be helpful to the study.

The RAB took a short break.

Relative Risk Site Evaluation Framework

Dunnie Wingo used a series of overhead graphics to discuss the relative risk ranking exercise he and Jim had been working on over the past few days. This is a living program that is updated as new data become available. The process was developed to assist in prioritizing funding for the approximately 5,000 IR sites for which the Navy is responsible. It is not a risk assessment, cannot be used as the basis for a no further action decision, or dictate a cleanup remedy. Other inputs to the determination include regulator comments and RAB comments; they are not reflected in the IR Site Ranking handout. Sites are ranked high, medium, or low based on three factors for each applicable medium (soil, surface water/sediment, and groundwater). The three factors include:

- contaminant hazard factor (objective determination) - how much contamination is present? The highest chemical concentration for each medium is used as the numerator divided by that medium's preliminary remediation goals established by EPA Region 9.

- migration pathway factor (subjective determination) - is or will contamination move to effect a receptor? Three tiers are established for each medium: evident (is or has moved); potential (may move or not enough information to assess); or confined (movement potential is limited).

- receptor factor - are humans or sensitive environments nearby?

Comment: Your handout identifies which media were used in your ranking exercise. I know there are data for some sites that are not included on the handout.

Response: If sampling data for the site are missing, the framework will not allow ranking for that medium.

Comment: If there is a strong likelihood of contamination but no analytical data are available, can you still factor that likelihood in? For instance, a drum is labeled as containing TCE but you have no laboratory data confirming that. Can that information be included?

Response: No. You have to test it.

Comment: Groundwater data exist for Tank Farm Five yet your handout only indicates soil was evaluated.

Response: Jim replied that if the summation of sampling results does not exceed standards, the data will not have an impact on the relative risk site evaluation model.

Comment: The Gould Island fact sheet indicates that cyanide was found in Gould Island sediments but that is not reflected in the ranking sheet.

Response: Jim stated it would be included in the ranking effort if the contamination emanated from the Electroplating Shop.

A lengthy discussion ensued as to whether these approaches were realistic. Since this issue was not directly pertinent to the RAB, Captain Wyman requested that the matter be pursued outside of the RAB meeting.

Dunnie discussed the final overhead, which demonstrated how 27 possibilities could exist (3 nine square matrices). The blocks closest to the far left of the matrix contain the highest number of characteristics used to rank a site. Those to the farthest right of the matrix contain the fewest, so would rank least high. The RAB will be provided with copies of these overheads with the draft minutes; in the interim, members may review similar information that was discussed by Bob Krivinskas at the March 1996 RAB meeting.

Comment: In order to score "high", can a site be high only in two categories?
Response: No. At least one sample is needed from each medium present at a site for it to be included.

Comment: Kymberlee pointed out that if there are no samples, and there is an evident Migration Pathway Factor and an identified Receptor Factor, it appears that the only ranking possible in all three matrices show is "high". The Gould Island Electroplating Shop (sediment eco-marine) was cited as an example.

OLD BUSINESS

Dave Brown continued the site priorities discussion. He emphasized that we need to be able to distinguish the amount of data available for each site. The Navy needs to spend money to gather data to assess where a site ranks. Jim mentioned that DOD guidance requires that approximately 70 percent of funds are used to support cleanup versus 30 percent allocated for studies. In the past, nearly 90 percent was spent on studies.

The matrices on which community members were to vote that was distributed at the last RAB meeting were collected and tallied during the earlier portion of this meeting. Gordon Bullard of Brown & Root collated the votes and evaluated the results. Nearly half of those voting used the numbers 1 through 3, exclusively, to rank the sites instead of using one number each from 1 to 12 to rank the twelve sites for funding priorities. The same phenomenon occurred for the site reuse vote. However, some trends were clear. Site 19 (Derecktor Shipyard) received the highest number of "1" votes for funding; Site 1 (McAllister Point Landfill) came in a close second. Coddington Cove Rubble Fill came in last. As to the site reuse vote, Tank Farm One appears to hold first place.

Some members expressed frustration at this vote because they did not feel they knew enough about all the sites to make an informed judgment in prioritizing them. Kathy Abbass was the only member who wished to revote based on the re-articulated instructions. The tally will be evaluated between now and the next meeting. Jim promised that the Navy will use the information as a planning tool.

Dave Brown talked about linking land use and Superfund cleanups. He gave some quotes from recent reports by Resources for the Future, which he felt provide a balanced perspective based on some case studies of cleanup sites. The main point in these excerpts was that anticipated future use of a site might well receive consideration along with environmental and cost-benefit criteria, but that there are reasons to be cautions: 1) It is no easy task to predict likely land use; pressures to use land in one way or another change quickly. 2) The effectiveness of institutional controls (zoning, environmental regulations, etc.) in guarding public interest is as yet unproven; design of land-use controls still needs to be improved in light of better knowledge about the legal and social factors that now make such controls vulnerable.

Dave went on to observe that, while the RAB's priorities-matrix exercise was confusing to some, it has served to 1) make us think more systematically about criteria that might be taken into account and 2) bring together and clarify risk rankings, remaining costs and time needed, sites likely to be retained by the Navy, and lack of knowledge about some sites. He felt that, for compatible Navy and community planning of land use along the Island's western shoreline, joint development of alternative scenarios would help. Since the town councils, planning boards and commissions will have important roles in determining the future character of the western shoreline, he urged RAB members to inform key leaders about status and plans of the NETC sites and, in turn, seek feedback from them.

NEXT RAB MEETING

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 21, 1998. Ken Finkelstein, from NOAA, will be the speaker at the 6 pm Project Committee meeting. The RAB agenda will feature a discussion on the conclusions of the RAB site priorities vote, and presentations by the Army Corps of Engineers (Gould Island investigations) and on the draft feasibility study for McAllister Point Landfill.

Handouts:	RAB Review Dates Calendar NUSC and Gould Island work plan fact sheets NUSC and Gould Island presentation overheads Initial results of NORTHDIV's Relative Risk Ranking Exercise
Enclosures:	Dunnie Wingo's Relative Risk Ranking overheads (w/ draft) Replacement page for the October RAB minutes (w/draft) Results of the November 19, 1997 RAB site priority balloting (w/draft) Executive Summary of the McAllister Point Landfill draft FS (w/draft)